



HannahArendt.net
Zeitschrift für politisches Denken
Journal for Political Thinking



On the occasion of the 30th Anniversary of Peace Institute
we kindly invite you to

International Conference

WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT?

Thinking Contemporary Forms of Government (Historical and Conceptual Perspectives)

2-4 June 2021, National Museum of Slovenia – Metelkova, Ljubljana

Organising committee: Vlasta Jalušič, PhD, researcher at the Peace Institute, Wolfgang Heuer, PhD, executive director of the Hannah Arendt Net and docent at the Otto Suhr Institute, Free University Berlin, Mirt Komel, PhD, researcher at the Peace Institute and lecturer at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Gorazd Kovačič, PhD, researcher and lecturer at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Boštjan Nedoh, PhD, researcher at the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and Lana Zdravković, PhD, researcher at the Peace Institute.

Partners: Peace Institute – Institute for Contemporary Social and Political Studies, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Hannah Arendt Net.



The conference is organised within the research project [“The Break in Tradition: Hannah Arendt and Conceptual Change”](#) (J5-1749), which is supported financially by the Slovenian Research Agency.

Published in 2021 by the Peace Institute, Metelkova 6, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

+386 1 234 77 20, info@mirovni-institut.si, www.mirovni-institut.si

Editors: Vlasta Jalušič and Lana Zdravković

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

Day One – Wednesday, 2. 6.

15:00 – 15:15 Opening session:

Vlasta Jalušič (conference organiser), **Iztok Šori** (director of the Peace Institute)

15:15 – 16:45 Keynote lecture 1 (Chair: Vlasta Jalušič)

Roger Berkowitz (Hannah Arendt Centre, Bard College, NYC, USA):

Revitalising Democracy: From Town Councils to Citizen Juries

17:00 – 18:30 Session one (Chair: Gorazd Kovačič)

Cristina Sanchez (Autonomous University, Madrid, Spain):

Incorporating the Demos through the Council System in Contemporary Democracies: From 15-M in Spain to the Chilean Constitutional Assemblies

Laura Degaspere Monte Mascaro (University of São Paulo, Brazil):

Federalism and Deconstruction in Hannah Arendt

19:00 Dinner

Day Two – Thursday, 3. 6.

11:30 – 13:30 Session two (Chair: Mirt Komel)

Zoran Kurelić (University of Zagreb, Croatia):

From Anti-liberalism to Illiberalism

Vlasta Jalušič (Peace Institute, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia):

Politikunfähigkeit: The Predicament of Our Time?

Dušan Rebolj (University College London, UK):

Why Courage Is Still a Fundamental Political Virtue

13:30 – 15:00 Lunch break

15:00 – 16:30 Keynote lecture 2 (Chair: Vlasta Jalušič)

Mahmood Mamdani (Columbia University, NYC, USA, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda):

Neither Settler nor Native. The Making and Unmaking of Permanent Minorities

16:45 – 18:45 Session three (Chair: Zoran Kurelić)

Tomaž Mastnak (Princeton University, USA, Slovenia):

Bonapartism

Waltraud Maints-Stender (University of Applied Sciences Niederrhein, Germany):

Understanding Political Change with Montesquieu

Wolfgang Heuer (Otto Suhr Institute, Free University, Berlin, Germany):

Re-sharpening the Dimensions of Plurality in the Face of Global Upheavals

19:00 Dinner

Day Three – Friday, 4. 6.

11:30 – 13:30 Session four (Chair: Dušan Rebolj)

Mirt Komel (University of Ljubljana, Peace Institute, Slovenia):

“Neither Rule nor Be Ruled”: The (Un)Form of Politics

Julija Bonai (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia):

To Govern Oneself or To Be Governed?

Anait Akopyan (Southern Federal University, Rostov on Don, Russia):

Bureaucracy as a Pervasive Phenomenon of Contemporary Governments

13:30 – 15:00 Lunch break

15:00 – 16:30 Session five (Chair: Mirt Komel)

Gorazd Kovačič (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia):

Rule by Decree, Aggressive Rhetoric, and Mass Movement: The Form of the Current Slovenian Government

Thiago Dias (University of São Paulo, Brazil):

Taking Care of the Eternal: Politics between Two Homes

16:30 Conclusion

19:00 Dinner

CONFERENCE BACKGROUND

In her ground-breaking analyses, such as *The Origins of Totalitarianism* and *Between Past and Future*, Hannah Arendt developed the thesis of the “break in the (political) tradition,” which could be identified at two levels. Its historical appearance is the “total domination” that occurred in the first half of the twentieth century, and, according to her, represents an entirely *novel form of government* that cannot be comprehended if thought of only as a more extreme form of despotism, tyranny, or dictatorship. On the other hand, the break also transpired in the Western political philosophy canon, with Marx, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche, who first noticed the new predicaments in the world that could no longer be explained by old, traditional categories of political thinking. Arendt’s main endeavour was to show how the use of the rest of the questionable tradition starts concealing instead of revealing the new phenomena and forms of government, and, simultaneously, an attempt at a reconstruction of some basic political concepts and experiences.

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the opening of the Iron Curtain (Churchill) marked the end of the so-called totalitarian period of the (post-)socialist condition, and the seeming restoration of democracy on a global scale. However, the question of the new forms of government did not re-emerge within the hegemonic currents of political theory, as one might expect. Rather than bringing the question of the emerging forms of government back into play, many theorists have accepted competing theses as to the “end of history” and the triumph of “liberal democracy” (Fukuyama), as either crude or happy reality. In this context, the current rise in populism and racism, the criminalisation of migration, building walls on borders, widespread corruption, attacks on the traditional division of powers, control over the media and organised lying, enlarged police powers, etc., are dismissed as the unhappy returns of “fascism”, while techno-managerial governance is usually conceived of as a sign of neoliberal “post-politics”. It seems, therefore, that it is increasingly difficult to answer the question as to the nature and form of many corrupt, undemocratic, oppressive, and abusive governments progressively emerging around the globe, now at the beginning of the 21st century. However, with few exceptions, a more profound reflection of what kind of government will materialise from these phenomena seems to remain highly “repressed” when it comes to these issues. It seems as if we are faced with a new type of power and a new type of government that evade conceptualisation. Is it just “a bad government”, “a failed state”, “an illiberal democracy”? Or should one label it “a new tyranny”? Fascism? Totalitarianism? Dictatorship? Authoritarianism? Sovereignism? Trumpism? Orbanism, etc.? This Conference seeks to foster debate as to two interrelated questions concerning the forms of government, which are at the same time highly neglected within the hegemonic currents of post-WWII Western political thought:

1. Conceptual questions: Which forms of government can be traced in contemporary politics? What are their features? How do they relate to other historical forms of government? What concepts are to be applied?
2. Methodological questions: How should the contemporary forms of government be properly analysed after the “break-in-tradition,” implying a gap between their historical forms as conceptualised by the political theory canon and forms of government that we can witness and are experiencing nowadays?

The focus of the Conference is on how contemporary forms government can be conceptualised. We are not only interested in case studies. The papers address the following questions: What are the roots of the conceptual hurdles with an analysis of the contemporary forms of government and new phenomena in this field? Whether and how can we return to the old questions when addressing new forms of government (who rules, what are the limitations of the power of the ruling elite, how much autonomy do the ruled have)? How do we address changes in the form of government if we do not conceptualise the issue in terms of the ruling and the ruled, domination and oppression, but take into account the political capacities, agency, and the question of the power or powerlessness of the people to act

together? Therefore, in addition to the traditional questions as regards what limitations and guarantees (rights, freedoms, autonomy, periodic elections) the government puts into effect, questions as to the conditions for political action can be addressed: Who can (may) act and by what obstruction of action do the rulers reproduce their power?

Elaborations on terminological problems in the discussion of forms of government; for example, which words, as concepts, are (to be) used, how are they translatable between different languages and circumstances, and which additional, even non-political, meanings do they carry in different languages while promoting certain semantic associations, will be presented at the Conference. Papers and lectures address new styles of politics that are gaining democratic legitimacy at elections and referendums and hybrid forms of governing and power that might escape the traditional framework of the division of powers, etc. Contributions are from different disciplines, such as political theory, political philosophy, the history of political philosophy, conceptual history, the sociology of politics, etc.

The conference represents one of the main events to celebrate the 30th birthday of the Peace Institute.

CONFERENCE KEY-NOTE LECTURERS AND PANELISTS ABSTRACTS AND BIOS

Roger Berkowitz (key-note lecturer)

Revitalising Democracy: Citizen Juries as a Response to the Failure of Expert Rule

The Greeks discovered three lawful forms of government – monarchy, aristocracy, and constitutional democracy – and three unlawful forms of governments – tyranny, oligarchy, and demagogic democracy. With the advent of totalitarianism in the 20th century, a new form of government emerged, one that exploded the traditional alternative between lawful and lawless government. Hannah Arendt understood that totalitarianism was a new form of government insofar as it sought to overcome the separation between law and justice. Totalitarianism subjugates real men to totalising and superhuman laws – the racialised laws of nature in Nazism and the class-based laws of history in Bolshevism. The horrors of totalitarianism are founded in its totalising claim to “establish the rule of justice on earth – something which the legality of positive law admittedly could never attain.”

At the foundation of totalitarianism’s lawful pursuit of the rule of justice there lies “[t]he despair of loneliness.” Lonely men crave meaning and belonging and find a home in quasi-scientific totalitarian movements. The post-totalitarian response to the terror of loneliness in modern politics is the rule of experts. Much like totalitarianism, which it succeeds, the rule of experts seeks to follow laws elevated above legality. Expert laws are issued by bureaucrats and administrators. These laws answer the needs of a lonely world because they subjugate

citizens to a technocratic rule of bureaucratic rationality that imagines justice to be a technical achievement. What is more, expert rule also divides the population along quasi-racialised lines, separating intellectuals who conceive the world according to rationality from the masses who are guided by feelings. The populist revolts roiling western technocratic states in recent years are the result of the breakdown of the technocratic claim to legitimacy. What we are now faced with is an all-out power struggle between the technocratic elites and the masses. In this paper, I explore one response to the danger of the failure of technocratic government, the turn to citizen assemblies, and sortition.

Roger Berkowitz is the founder and academic director of the Hannah Arendt Centre for Politics and Humanities and a professor of politics, philosophy, and human rights at Bard College. Professor Berkowitz authored *The Gift of Science: Leibniz and the Modern Legal Tradition* (Harvard, 2005; Fordham, 2010; Chinese Law Press, 2011). He is the editor of *The Perils of Invention: Lying, Technology, and the Human Condition* (forthcoming 2021) and co-editor of *Thinking in Dark Times: Hannah Arendt on Ethics and Politics* (2009), *The Intellectual Origins of the Global Financial Crisis* (2012), and *Artifacts of Thinking: Reading Hannah Arendt's Denktagebuch* (2017). His works have appeared in *The New York Times*, *The American Interest*, *Bookforum*, *The Forward*, *The Paris Review Online*, *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas*, and many other publications. He is a co-editor of *Just Ideas*, a book series published by Fordham University Press. He is the winner of the 2019 Hannah Arendt Prize for Political Thought awarded by the Heinrich Böll Foundation in Bremen, Germany.

Cristina Sanchez

Incorporating the Demos through the Council System in Contemporary Democracies: From 15-M in Spain to the Chilean constitutional assemblies

This paper analyses Hannah Arendt's proposal on councils, examining the different modulations of these in her work, and confronts it with contemporary forms of political participation outside political parties. Two contemporary cases will be discussed: the 15-M movement in Spain, and the current electoral moment in Chile to elect the constituent power. We will see the differences and similarities between these two cases, from an Arendtian perspective, while we will analyse their permanence as new forms of government.

Cristina Sanchez is a professor of philosophy of law at the Autonomous University Madrid. She has published widely on the work of Hannah Arendt, and has been invited to Chile, Argentina, Mexico, and Colombia to give lectures and courses on this author. Her research topics include contemporary feminist theory and women's citizenship. She is currently directing a research project on political violence and gender, with researchers from Spain, Germany, Colombia, Argentina, and Chile. Her current focus is on mass violence against women in armed conflicts and transitional scenarios. She is one of the spokespersons of the International Association of Women Philosophers (IAPH).

Laura Degaspere Monte Mascaro

Federalism and Deconstruction in Hannah Arendt

Federalism as a way of thinking defies what our vocabulary presents in terms of opposition and contradiction. I intend to explore federalism in Hannah Arendt's work as (i) a form of state in relationship to the system of councils as a form of government; and (ii) as a form of thinking, as a "principle of organisation". Federalism in Arendt's work is linked to the system of councils, which would be responsible for structuring and institutionalising international federalism, from local bases to an international parliament, transcending nation state frontiers. It consists of a form of state and government that (i) multiplies the spheres of institutional organisation, and allows (ii) the participation and rescue of public liberty, public happiness, and the public spirit that inspired revolutions, (iii) the overcoming of the oligarchic model of representation by parties that ended up prevailing in modern representative democracies, and (iv) the overcoming of nation state sovereignty. Federalism defies the frontiers between domestic and foreign that shape international relations, between the government and the people that co-form representative democracies. I claim that this Arendtian "principle of organisation" is close to the task of deconstruction, which seeks a way of thinking that rescues the "undecidable" – a third irreducible to the dualisms of classic ontology – that unbalances the oppositions of the metaphysical and political traditions. Therefore, I intend to establish a dialogue between Arendtian and deconstructionist thought, while investigating the federalist model of Arendt as an undecidable political and epistemic model.

Laura Degaspere Monte Mascaro graduated in law and obtained a Master's Degree from the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Law of the Faculty of Law (University of São Paulo) and a PhD in French Literature from the Faculty of Philosophy, Letters and Human Sciences (University of São Paulo). She was a guest researcher at Université Paris III – Sorbonne Nouvelle. Her doctoral thesis, *Memory and truth in La Douleur* of Marguerite Duras, was nominated for the "Tese Destaque USP – 2018" and "Capes Tese – 2018" awards. She is currently a law professor at University São Judas Tadeu, a member of the research group Violence in Dark Times at the University of São Paulo, and works as a lawyer in mediation and arbitration.

Zoran Kurelić

From Anti-liberalism to Illiberalism

The optimistic idea of the transition presupposed two things: first, that liberal democracy would dominate globally after the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, and second, that the former socialist countries would willingly become liberal democracies. Neither of these presuppositions turned out to be true. Liberal democracy is said to be in crisis and former socialists were never keen on becoming liberals in the first place. Numerous former socialist countries (Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Croatia, Slovakia) are now under the strong ideological influence of illiberal sovereigntism. It is not difficult to understand that a liberal democracy as

a form of government, a regime derived from the values of the bourgeois revolutions, cannot be established if the majority of the population does not hold liberal values. In this paper, I will show how illiberalism represents a much more attractive ideological solution for the former real-socialist anti-liberals than liberalism itself. As a form of new collectivism, it secures a solidarity based on national identification, anti-globalism, anti-free market capitalism, anti-immigration, and religion-based conservatism. Universal human rights and individual liberty are not relevant for the illiberal ideology and they are increasingly questioned by the new populist leaders. In this paper I present and interpret the ideas of radically different writers – liberals such as J. S. Mill and Brian Barry and anti-liberals such as Slavoj Žižek and Franjo Tuđman. I also present the ideas and concepts of distinguished illiberals such as Victor Orban and Steve Bannon. I argue that liberal values in countries such as Slovenia and Croatia, in which the majority of the population are not liberalised, can only have a chance of gaining support if the EU survives as a fully functional liberal project.

Zoran Kurelić is a professor at the Department of Political and Social Theory of the Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb. He graduated in political science from the University of Zagreb. He gained his MSc from the London School of Economics, and his PhD from The New School for Social Research, New York. He is a co-founder and the director of the Master European Studies Programme at the Faculty of Political Science, Zagreb. His recent publications include topics such as unwilling Europeanisation, fake democracy, and Arendt's concept of radical evil.

Vlasta Jalušić

"Politikunfähigkeit": The Predicament of Our Time?

Three theses as to the current form of government will be presented. *The first* is that the current, "post-totalitarian", form of government is characterised by a mixture of elements that occurred with the rise of 20th-century totalitarian forms of government and still persist (imperialism, colonial and bureaucratic rule, racism, etc.), and were supplemented by some new or rather transformed old elements (the politics of lying, the fusion of powers, enhanced rule-by-decree, the dual state, and citizenship). *The second* is that, in spite of several attempts to provide a comprehensive account of total domination, these were to a large extent insufficient explanations or at least did not enable an understanding of the "nature" of total domination, due to what Arendt calls the "questionable remains of tradition," and the continuous use of false analogies ("fascism", for example). *The third* is that, due to these questionable remains of tradition (which are also elaborated in a specific way), the moral "side" or dimension of politics, the political current coming from it, and the group perceived as emancipatory (liberals and left), are increasingly incapable of politics (*politikunfähig*) and willingly or unwillingly leave politics to populist leaders and even to those who could be – under certain conditions – called a "mob" (ochlocracy).

The paper proceeds from Reinhard Koselleck's thesis that the modern constitution of politics is marked by the separation of morality from politics, with the moral side posing as the side

of progress and liberation, the emancipation from traditional ties, while being focused on the future. It also draws on Hannah Arendt's thesis that in the modern – and especially in the post-totalitarian – constellation, politics is increasingly seen as corrupt, violent, and tied to bureaucratic power and the unnecessary state. This perception is reinforced by the already existing anti-political tendencies, and attempts at reducing politics as action to a minimum, while increasing non-participation and raising the unwillingness among educated, talented, and competent people to engage in politics.

Vlasta Jalušič is a senior researcher and one of the founders of the Peace Institute and an associate professor at the University of Ljubljana. She has degrees in political science, sociology, and fine arts. Her PhD in 1996 from the University of Vienna is "On Violence and Politics in Hannah Arendt's Works". She is the author of numerous books, articles, and chapters in books on the women's movement and feminism, gender and political theory, violence, war, and collective crime. She has edited and translated several main works of H. Arendt into the Slovenian language and published a book on her thinking and understanding of the post-totalitarian era (*Evil of Thoughtlessness. Arendtian Exercises in Understanding the Post-totalitarian Times and Collective Crimes*, in the Slovenian language)

Dušan Rebolj

Why Courage is Still a Fundamental Political Virtue

The paper argues for renewed interest in the political virtue of courage in republicanism and in other strains of normative democratic theory. It defines courage and answers the following question: Why does courage, so defined, continue to have a place in politics, despite the theoretical and institutional challenges to its relevance?

Courage is a property of acts or a trait of character that entails two aspects: daring, which is persistence, or the capacity to persist, in behaviours sufficiently risky to oneself; and practical wisdom, which is the correct application – or the capacity to correctly apply – a set of morals to circumstances in which one takes risks. Any number of sets of morals can apply, but some kind of morality must guide daring action if it is to be a candidate for the ascription of courage. Courage continues to be relevant to contemporary democratic theory because: it can be conceived in an instrumental rather than a eudaimonistic way; it can supplement rather than supplant the post-enlightenment virtues of sociability and cooperation; and it can result from contemporary democratic institutional schemes that seek to mechanise virtue rather than trusting citizens to spontaneously provide virtuous actions.

Most importantly, as Plato and Kant elaborated in different ways, courage is foundational to the very idea of political emancipation and self-determination. This is due to its intimate link with knowledge. Courage is also the capacity, to the extent that people possess such a capacity, to risk the pain of knowing and acting on the correct thing. It enables one to become aware of the range of one's options and to not adapt preferences in the face of the risks

involved in satisfying them. Thus, in the language of the analytical theories of power, courage acts as a counterweight to power's third dimension. If this dimension is revealed by the capacity of the agent's sheer presence to confuse and/or silence potential resisters to the agent's agenda, then courage is the capacity of potential resisters to articulate and express their opposition. The opposition will be daring to the extent that it poses well-defined dangers to the resisters, and practically wise to the extent that it confines their risk-taking to some idea of justice or legitimacy. The paper concludes by speculating where this notion of courage 'cashes out' in real world politics, especially with regard to the diminution of the constitutional essentials in (il)liberal democracies.

Before commencing his PhD studies in political theory at UCL's Department of Political Science & School of Public Policy, **Dušan Rebolj** obtained an MSc in political theory from the London School of Economics and Political Science, and a BA in Philosophy from the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. His PhD thesis, situated in the tradition of republicanism, will reconceptualise the virtue of political courage for use in contemporary normative democratic theory. Besides republicanism, Dušan's research interests include other justifications of democracy, public reason, theories of power, liberal and illiberal accounts of states of emergency, nationalism, and the history of political thought. At UCL, he has helped teach courses on ethics in public policy and on justice. He is a long-time translator of books and films, and a film critic. He lives and works in Ljubljana and London.

Mahmood Mamdani (key-note lecturer)

Neither Settler nor Native. The Making and Unmaking of Permanent Minorities

The lecture will take up the main argument from the book *Neither Settler nor Native*: that the nation state and the colonial state created each other. In case after case around the globe – from the New World to South Africa, from Israel and Germany to Sudan – the colonial state and the nation state have been mutually constructed through the politicisation of a religious or ethnic majority at the expense of an equally manufactured minority.

The model emerged in North America, where genocide and internment on reservations created both a permanent native underclass and the physical and ideological spaces in which new immigrant identities crystallised as a settler nation. In Europe, this template would be used by the Nazis to address the Jewish Question, and, after the fall of the Third Reich, by the Allies to redraw the boundaries of Eastern Europe's nation states, cleansing them of their minorities. After Nuremberg, the template was used to preserve the idea of the Jews as a separate nation. By establishing Israel through the minoritisation of Palestinian Arabs, Zionist settlers followed the North American example. The result has been another cycle of violence.

Political violence demands political solutions: not criminal justice for perpetrators, but a rethinking of the political community for all survivors – victims, perpetrators, bystanders, and beneficiaries – based on common residence and the commitment to build a common future without the permanent political identities of settler and native.

Mahmood Mamdani is the Herbert Lehman professor of government and professor of anthropology and of Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies (MESAAS) at Columbia University and director of the Makerere Institute of Social Research in Kampala. He is the author of *Citizen and Subject* (1996), *When Victims Become Killers* (2001), *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim* (2005), *Saviours and Survivors* (2009), and *Neither Settler nor Native* (2020).

Tomaž Mastnak

Bonapartism

Bonapartism is a relatively new political concept. It denoted a new type of political power that emerged at the close of the so-called Great French Revolution and then after the defeat of the 1848 revolution in France, to later spread to other European countries. Historical Bonapartism is relevant today for two main reasons. First, the emergence of Bonapartism marked the first time the classical categories of “forms of government” failed to capture the reality of political power. The “forms of government” have never recovered their authority even though we by inertia still use them, while we are at a loss for concepts to define the powers that be. Second, after much maligning of Louis Bonaparte, Marx and Engels ended up describing Bonapartism as “*the state power of modern class rule.*” As such, Bonapartism does not belong to the past and its historical form may give us clues for understanding our present political predicament.

Tomaž Mastnak is a research scholar at the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies, Princeton University, and emeritus director of research at the Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. He is working on the history of political and social thought.

Waltraud Mauts-Stender

Understanding Political Change with Montesquieu. Remarks on the Critical Engagement of Hannah Arendt and Althusser with Montesquieu in Times of Crisis.

Against the background of the current debates on the “crisis of democracy”, Montesquieu’s “Spirit of the Laws” seems worthy of a re-reading because in the current attempts to grasp the crisis of democracy, such as in the distinction between politics and the political or with the term “postdemocracy” or further within discussions about “democracy and capitalism”, the debates almost always revolve around the connection between the institutional order and political action.

If one relates Montesquieu’s distinction between the form and the principle of government to today’s debates, one moment immediately catches the eye: with Montesquieu, not only the disintegration of the form and principle of government, but also the stagnation of the political institutions could be stated. At the same time, it opens up the possibility of determining whether either endogenous factors (e.g. the abuse of power) or exogenous factors (social factors / social injustice) underlie the non-observance of principles or whether both exogenous and endogenous factors mutually condition and/or reinforce each other.

With Montesquieu's distinctions, it becomes possible to grasp the connection between politics, political institutions, and their social preconditions.

Waltraud Meints-Stender studied philosophy and social sciences at the Georg-August-University in Göttingen and at the Leibniz University in Hanover. She has taught at the University of North London, the Carl von Ossietzky University in Oldenburg, and the Leibniz University in Hanover, and was a professor of political education at the Leuphana University of Lüneburg. Since 2013, she has been a professor of politics and education at the Niederrhein University. Her research areas are political theory, theories of power, and concepts of political judgement.

Wolfgang Heuer

Re-sharpening the Dimensions of Plurality in the Face of Global Upheavals

We find ourselves in a situation of global upheaval and the emergence of a new world order in which the idea and existence of liberal democracies are being challenged by autocratic and dictatorial regimes as well as populist currents. In order to resist this development, it is proposed to discuss the Arendt-inspired reflection on four political-philosophical phenomena of contemporary republican thought: the underlying anthropological understanding of plurality, its political institutionalisation in the form of federalism, the corresponding cosmopolitan dimension of judgment, and the change in the perspective of global sustainability in relation to nature and politics.

Wolfgang Heuer is a docent at Otto Suhr-Institute, Free University Berlin, managing editor of HannahArendt.net, a guest professor in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Spain, a course director at IUC Dubrovnik, and co-editor of the *Arendt Handbuch* 2011. He has extensively researched and published on Arendt, violence, and federalism, and is working on the publication of unpublished manuscripts in the Collected Works of Hannah Arendt.

Mirt Komel

“Neither Rule nor Be Ruled”: The (Un)Form of Politics

The paper takes a cue from Hannah Arendt's recurrent reference to “neither rule nor be ruled” from Herodotus's *Histories* (ἱστορίαι) as one of the rare definitions of politics that does not identify it with government or governability, in order to tackle the issue of the “new form(s) of government” in opposition to a definition of political action as an “(un)form of government” that resists institutionalisation, and broadly coincides with what Hegel – while critically reworking Rousseau's theory of the social contract – labelled “the real general will” in the “Spirit” chapter of his *Phenomenology of Spirit*.

Mirt Komel is a philosopher and writer, a professor of philosophy and literature, the head of the Cultural Studies Department at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, a researcher at the Institute of Philosophy and the Peace Institute in Ljubljana, and co-founder of the international Hegelian association *Aufhebung*.

Julija Bonai

To Govern Oneself or To Be Governed?

In his book *Will to Power*, Nietzsche talks about the politics of virtue, contrasting it with virtuous politics. He assumes that any mode of government that uses domination to impose presupposed virtues on others cannot be virtuous. Namely, to be virtuous does not mean to impose or to dominate, but to be able to create, to give, and to share with others. The ability to create refers primarily to the creation and transformation of one's own potential. This potential implies in itself the scope of possible modes of differentiation and action. Since the power of people with a narrow scope of abilities is weak, that results in their irresistible urge to govern, dominate, and totalise others. Furthermore, their possible mode of differentiation is binary, oppositional, and exclusive, whilst their possible scope of action is limited to re-action and negation.

On the other hand, widening the scope of possible abilities enables one to act in an affirmative way. The differentiation becomes inclusive, adding new modes of possible transformations to the existing ones. This implies the ability to cultivate and govern oneself in connection with and according to others. Following these assumptions, the paper investigates the human ability to change one's own potential in order for the politics of virtue to possibly become virtuous politics. This problematic is approached from ontological, political, and psychological points of view.

Julija Bonai is a researcher in the field of political philosophy, philosophy of mind, and psychoanalysis. Her doctoral thesis focused on the role of desire (understood as will power) in connection with different modes of power relations, explained from an ethical point of view. She is particularly interested in contemporary French philosophy. As a yoga teacher, she also investigates and writes about the philosophy and psychology of yoga.

Anait Akopyan

Bureaucracy as a Pervasive Phenomenon of Contemporary Governments

Bureaucracy today has penetrated so much into the structure of governments that it has become perceived as a 'necessary' and 'obligatory' phenomenon without delving far into its essence and possible defects. Against this background, the current study provides a constructive overview of academic literature on this concept, with particular attention devoted to Hannah Arendt's vision of bureaucracy and its characteristic features and criticism.

As the most tyrannical form of domination, bureaucratic structures turn into a relatively eternal organism, in which there is no one left to argue or exchange opinions with, or with whom to try to find the best ways to solve an issue. Instead, bureaucracy introduces the requirement of unquestioning obedience to each descending hierarchical step, while in order

to achieve that, violence often comes into play. Consequently, the more bureaucratised public life is, the more attractive violence is. As a pervasive phenomenon itself, bureaucracy becomes a subsidiary form of government with the varying degree of its impact depending on the main form of government established in a particular society or country. The paper also analyses the impact of the available set of ICTs and the Internet together with the role of education and Arendtian thinking in tackling the hardships that bureaucracies routinely generate.

Anait Akopyan is a PhD candidate at the Institute of Philosophy, Social and Political Studies of the Southern Federal University in Russia. She is currently engaged in teaching activities at the Institute of Philology, Journalism and Intercultural Communication of the same university. Her academic background covers human rights and democratisation (Yerevan State University, Armenia), EU international relations and diplomacy studies (College of Europe, Belgium), and educational technology (University of Tartu, Estonia).

Gorazd Kovačič

Rule by Decree, Aggressive Rhetoric, and Mass Movement: The Form of the Current Slovenian Government

The paper will analyse the form of government being developed by the current Slovenian regime of Janez Janša. Descriptive designations such as “populist” or “far right” are too shallow, and the metaphor of “fascism” is exaggerated. A proper qualification will be provided by analysing how the regime has been undermining the modern system of institutional checks and balances, including the constitutional separation of powers, the professional autonomy of various public institutions, and the inclusion of social partners and other organised social interest groups in creating policies. The regime has been ruling by weekly decrees imposing measures against the epidemic, and by intervention acts providing subsidies to the economic victims of the measures. A series of these decrees was proclaimed illegal by the courts, but the Government has ignored these verdicts and has not prepared a proper amendment to the Communicable Diseases Act. A number of provisions in the intervention acts turned out to be counterproductive, after the Government systematically ignored the warnings and proposals of various social partners. The police have been taken over by the ruling party and misused in order to repress street protests by the disproportionate imposition of fines. An important tool for undermining the separation of powers and the inclusion of social partners in deliberative democracy, and for preventing any public critique has been the daily production of aggressive rhetoric against every personality or institution voicing any criticism of the regime, from journalists to the Constitutional Court. The propaganda machinery of the ruling party’s media and within social media is also creating a parallel ideological world in which Janša is the adored hero and a victim of conspiracies. It prevents his fans from facing the external reality, i.e. Janša’s clear failure to adequately manage the epidemic. In terms of attempts to transform the structure of the political system, the Janša regime can be defined as an

authoritarian one, while there are certain similarities to historical totalitarian movements if the organisation of the ruling party and its propaganda are taken into account.

Gorazd Kovačič is an assistant professor lecturing on economic and political sociology at the University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Sociology. He authored the books *Against the Social: The concept of the social in the Hannah Arendt's thought and the limits of sociology* and *Thinking the Breaks, Breaking Ideologies* (both in Slovenian).

Thiago Dias

Taking Care of the Eternal: Politics between Two Homes

It is a known fact that Arendt's critique of Marx relies on the claim that he merged two different activities, labour and work, into one concept. I claim that she did so by separating the different *temporalities* of these two activities. Marx's concept of *Arbeit* has a *circular* relation between man and nature (*metabolism*), and the accumulation of these various "cycles", which forms the *line* of history. Circular time offers us a certain experience of the eternal in the constant, ever-recurring movement that ontologically structures *nature*. This eternity is found in the biological life of individuals and in the private realm (*oikonomía*), as well as in the balance of the Earth (*oikos logia*). The modern economy, by substituting wealth for capital, linked the cycle to the idea of an unlimited process of linear accumulation. Let loose, this unnatural growth of the cycle introduced its cumulative character to the Earth cycle itself and started a new Age (the Anthropocene).

The life cycle consists of two moments, production and consumption, and unlimited accumulation has denied both to an increasing number of people. Growth large enough to include everyone in the cycle has been tried, but it puts pressure on the Earth's cycle and denies the evidence that *universal* inclusion in the realm of production is no longer possible. However, if we consider consumption not as an engine of growth, but as the *basic* activity for the condition of life, it may be possible to imagine the inclusion of even those who do not enter the realm of production, of even those who have no *outcome* to offer. A *universal basic income* may thus help us to bind the life cycle to its due meaning. Without the urgency to create jobs, or to consume in order to keep the wheel turning, there may be room to take care of the eternal natural cycles that bestow meaning on two fundamental *oikoi* activities: economy and ecology.

Thiago Dias has a PhD in Philosophy, with his thesis entitled "Totalitarianism, Time and Action: An Interpretation of Hannah Arendt's *The Human Condition*", 2018. As a researcher, he is currently working at the Centre for the Study of Violence at the Faculty of Philosophy, Languages and Human Sciences, University of São Paulo. He has published academic articles, mainly on Hannah Arendt's political thought, and he has translated two of her books into Brazilian Portuguese. He was a visiting researcher at the Free University Berlin.